

Assignment #2

First explain the traditional analysis of “knowledge” according to which knowledge is justified true belief. To do this, you must explain each of the components of this analysis (belief, truth and justification) and the reasons for thinking each of these properties is necessary for knowledge.

Second, explain Gettier’s argument against the traditional analysis using an example of your own. (I want you to provide a “Gettier-style” counter-example to the traditional analysis, but don’t use the examples that Gettier uses.)

Third, explain how Harman uses Principle P to modify the traditional analysis in order to formulate an analysis of “knowledge”—JTB + adherence to Principle P—that is invulnerable to Gettier’s counter-examples.

Fourth, describe at least one of the counter-examples to Harman’s revised analysis (i.e. the claim that knowledge is JTB + adherence to Principle P) that Harman discusses, or at least one of the counter-examples to this thesis that we discussed in class.

Fifth, describe how Harman uses Principle Q to further modify the traditional analysis and formulate an analysis of “knowledge”—JTB + adherence to Principles P and Q—that is invulnerable to the cases of “evidence that one does not possess” that he discusses.

Finally, evaluate whether Harman’s final analysis is correct (so that knowledge really is JTB+ adherence to Principles P and Q). Does the account of knowledge Harman endorses at the end of his essay fully mesh with our intuitions? Does it capture our shared conception of knowledge? Can we use it to argue against skepticism about the external world?

5-6 Pages; double spacing, normal font and margins (e.g. Word default settings and Times 12 point); **due 11/15/17 in class**